

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application.

The Examiner has indicated that the reference cited in the information disclosure statement filed with the present application has not been considered. This issue is considered moot as the reference is unrelated to the present application. The originally cited reference was listed in the specification. However, the specification contained a typographical error. This error has been corrected by the present amendment, and the reference referred to in the specification has already been supplied.

Claims 8, 12, 16, and 20 have been amended to clarify the subject matter defined thereby. The dependency of claim 11 has been corrected. Thus, it is believed that the formal objections set forth in the Office action have been resolved.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 200300110925 to Watanabe. The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4 is traversed for the following reasons.

The invention defined in claim 1 is generally directed toward a radiological image pickup apparatus having a radiation detection section that is disposed in a cabinet. At least a portion of the cabinet, which is a surface lid section opposed to and just above the voltage application electrode, is formed of a nonconductive material. It is respectfully submitted that the Watanabe reference does not teach or suggest such structure.

Watanabe teaches a casing 201a formed from a carbon fiber reinforced

plastic (CFRP) material and aluminum. CFRP is a material having a good radio transparency, and is generally used in the medical imaging field. As noted in paragraph [0046] of Watanabe, the CFRP material is used because it has an x-ray absorption rate that is lower than that of the remainder of the casing, which is formed from aluminum. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, CFRP is a conductive material as it includes carbon fiber. Conductive properties of CFRP are well known in the art, as any internet search will reveal. Thus, the lid section of the Watanabe casing is conductive.

Accordingly, Watanabe cannot be cited as teaching a cabinet "wherein at least a portion just above the voltage application electrode is formed of a nonconductive material in a surface lid section of said cabinet opposed to the voltage application electrode" as required by claim 1. Rather, it is considered apparent that Watanabe, by forming the casing section 201a of a CFRP material, teaches making the 'portion just above the voltage application electrode' from a conductive material, and thereby actively teaches away from the claimed invention. The Examiner's attention to this fact is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and claims 2-4 that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by the Watanabe publication. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 is hereby requested.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of US 6667481 to Teranuma and US 6667480 to Kajiwara. In this regard, it is noted that the secondary references are cited for teaching an insulating substance or a shield member.

Neither of these references teach or suggest a forming a surface lid section of the cabinet disposed just above and opposed to the voltage application electrode from a nonconductive material, as required by claim 1 and as lacking from the primary reference, Watanabe. Accordingly, it is submitted that each of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 are likewise allowable. More specifically, even if the references were combined as advocated by the Examiner, the invention defined in claim 1 would not result. Rather, further modification of the combination would be required to arrive at the present invention.

Finally, claims 7, 11, 15, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, Teranuma, and Kajiwara in view of US 6667480 to Hashimoto. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

It is again noted that the Hashimoto reference does not correct the deficiencies of the base Watanabe reference, described hereinbefore with reference to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, even if the references were combined as proposed by the Examiner, the invention defined in claim 1, from which claims 7, 11, 15, 19, and 20 depend, would not result. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 11, 15, 19, and 20 is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please

charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. NGB-15437.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By 
David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34732

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700